

7. (Amended) The liquid crystal display of Claim 1,6 wherein the effective light path difference  $\Delta n d$  of the liquid crystal layer is equal to a half of the predetermined wavelength.
8. (Amended) The liquid crystal display of Claim 16, wherein the transmissive axis of the first polarizer is perpendicular to the transmissive axis of the ~~additional~~second polarizer.
9. (Amended) The liquid crystal display of Claim 1,6 wherein a combination of the values ( $\Theta 1$ ,  $\Theta 2$ ,  $\Theta 3$ ,  $\Theta 4$ ) is one selected from athe group consisting of combinations (15, 75, 165, 105), and (75,15,105,165), (105,165,75,15), ~~and (165,105,15,75).~~
10. Cancelled.
11. (Amended) The liquid crystal display of Claim 1,10 wherein the display region is made of pixels having a thin film transistor and a region of the respective pixels is divided into a reflective region and a transmissive region.
12. (Amended) The liquid crystal display of Claim 1,10 wherein thickness of the liquid crystal layer is controlled by regional thickness of an organic insulating layer.

#### **REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. By this Amendment, claims 6 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice to or

disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, and claims 1-5, 7-9, 11 and 12 have been amended. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11 and 12 are pending in this application.

**Claim Objection**

Claim 9 is objected to for being in improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Specific language in claim 9 is identified as forming the basis for the objection. Claim 9 has been amended responsive to the objection. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for containing insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant notes that the Office Action states that claim 16 is rejected. However, Applicant believes that the rejection of claim 16 is an inadvertent typographical error. Rather, it is understood by the Applicant that claim 6 is rejected. Claim 1, which now also recites the features of cancelled claim 6, and claim 7 have been amended responsive to the rejection. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,204,904 issued to Tillin, *et al.* (hereinafter "Tillin"). The rejection of claims 1-4 over Tillin has been rendered moot by the incorporation of the features of claims 6 and 10 into claim 1, from which claims 2-3 depend. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,341,002 issued to Shimizu, *et al.* (hereinafter "Shimizu") in view of Tillin; and claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) over Tillin in view of U. S. Patent 5,249,071 issued to Yoshimizu, *et al.* (hereinafter “Yoshimizu”). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Page 6 of the Office Action states that Shimizu at least fails to disclose the relationship between the two slow axes of the first and second retardation films and a transmissive axis of the first and second polarizer, respectively. Page 6 of the Office Action further states that Tillin discloses a half wavelength retardation film and a quarter wavelength retardation film which make an angle  $\Theta 1$  and  $\Theta 2$  with a transmissive axis of the polarizer, respectively and that Tillin discloses  $\Theta 1$  as being  $15^\circ$  while  $\Theta 2$  is  $75^\circ$ . Thus, page 6 of the Office Action states that Tillin overcomes the deficiencies of Shimizu and that the combination of Shimizu and Tillin renders obvious the features recited in Applicant’s claim 6. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits that Tillin only discloses a reflective liquid crystal device (Title) and nowhere does Tillin suggest a liquid crystal display, wherein a display region is divided into a reflective region and a transmissive region, as recited in Applicant’s claim 1. Further, the object of Shimizu is to disclose a liquid crystal display device capable of performing a display in both a reflection mode and a transmissive mode (col. 1, lines 6-9). Accordingly, Applicant submits that there is no motivation, other than impermissible hindsight reasoning, to combine the teachings of Shimizu, which relate to a reflection/transmission type liquid crystal device, and the teachings of Tillin, which relate to a reflective type liquid crystal device, to disclose Applicant’s claimed invention regarding a transmissive and a reflective type liquid crystal display. Thus, Applicant submits that Tillin does not overcome the deficiencies of Shimizu with regard to claims 1-5, 7-9, 11 and 12. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Tillin fails to overcome the deficiencies of Shimizu and, therefore, the combination of Shimizu and Tillin fails to disclose all the features of Applicant’s claim 1. In addition, Applicant submits that the combination of

Shimizu and Tillin also fails to disclose all the features of claims 2-5, 7-9, 11 and 12, which depend from claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**


All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11 and 12 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that any extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required at this moment. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 23-1951. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 23-1951.

Yong-Kyu JANG  
09/576,129

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: September 9, 2003

McGuire Woods LLP  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280

\\COM\195417.1